1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
2	WESTERN DIVISION
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Docket No. 3:10CR251
4	Plaintiffs,) Toledo, Ohio
5	v.) January 10, 2011
6	HOR AND AMERA AKL,) Bond Hearing
7	Defendant.)
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF BOND HEARING
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES G. CARR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	For the Plaintiffs: Justin E. Herdman
14	Thomas E. Getz Office of the U.S. Attorney
15	801 Superior Avenue, W Suite 400
16	Cleveland, Ohio 44113 (216) 622-3965
17	S. Elisabeth Poteat
18	U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
19	Washington DC 20530 (202) 616-9822
20	For the Defendant: Jeffrey J. Helmick
21	Helmick & Hoolahan 1119 Adams Street
22	2nd Floor Toledo, Ohio 43604
23	(419) 243-3800
24	Sanford A. Schulman 500 Griswold Street
25	Suite 2340 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 963-4740

Angela D. Nixon, RPR, CRR Court Reporter: 1716 Spielbusch Avenue Toledo, Ohio 43624 (419) 260-5259 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by notereading.

```
COURTROOM DEPUTY: Case number 3:10CR251 United
 1
 2
     States of America versus Akl. Matter called for a bond
 3
     hearing.
 4
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. Mr. Herdman?
 5
               MR. HERDMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.
                                                        How are
 6
     you?
 7
               THE COURT: And with you are?
 8
               MR. HERDMAN: Elisabeth Poteat, counter-terrorism
 9
     section of U.S. Department of Justice, and Tom Getz.
10
               MR. 6789: Sanford Schulman appearing on Amera.
               MR. HELMICK: Jeff Helmick for Hor Akl; however
11
12
     we're here to implicate Mrs. Akl, and it's with the consent
1.3
     of her counsel.
14
               THE COURT: Record should show that the
15
     defendants have requested that I modify intensely
16
     restrictive conditions of release to allow Mrs. Akl to
17
     visit with their children who are residing with Mr. Akl.
18
    As we all are well aware, I have as a condition of release
19
     required that the family -- the husband and wife, the
20
     co-defendants, not live or reside together. The request is
21
     that there be a five-hour window when both parents would be
2.2
     available with the children, at least two of whom are high
23
     school students.
24
               MR. HELMICK: One in high school, Your Honor, one
25
     in elementary school, one preschool.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. For some reason I thought the middle child was older and that the younger child was quite younger. The government imposes that request. Do you wish to be heard -- let me ask you, Mr. Helmick, do you wish to be heard further?

MR. HELMICK: If I would be heard, it would only be in response to their objection, which, as I understand it, the government has been consistent, we certainly understand their objection that the flight risk for either or both of these defendants goes up when the two of them -or if the two of them are together. And clearly that's part of what we're proposing. However, we're not talking about residing, we're talking about visitation. There would certainly be a court-approved custodian present during that period of time. Both can be on monitoring, they're already on monitoring, both can remain or be on monitoring, or we can even impose GPS monitoring if necessary. And this window of time -- Judge, without complicity, to put it quite bluntly, with a court-approved custodian, their escape, they're not going to be able to leave during this period of time. That risk may go up overnight when the custodian is asleep if the two of them are together in the same household and conspired to leave at the same time. But in order for it to occur during this window of time as we've proposed, which we think is a

2.2

reasonable accommodation under the circumstances, they would -- they would have to have involvement and complicity with court-approved custodian. They would have to have the resources available to them to effect an escape, and The Court has their passports and driver's license. They have no personal immediate access to money of their own, which they could use to help facilitate in this case. And as The Court is aware, there is a substantial amount of family, parents, aunts, uncles, cousins and so forth that have been posted in this case for both defendants that are at risk and would be taken by this Court should they violate any material term of conditions of release. We think this window, this opportunity is reasonable.

I'm frankly pleading this on behalf of my client and his co-defendant's mental health as well as the goodness and benefit of the children as well. My client does not have a great deal by the way of formal education. Amera Akl does, and that's of great assistance to the children completing homework assignments and other matters. Frankly, Judge, as a high school student, he's somewhat lost, and helping him with some of the assignments he has in high school with regard to Advanced English. The young man is a good student, but he needs help. We think this is a reasonable accommodation which presents minimal risk of what the government fears, and we urge The Court to grant

it under these circumstances or under similar conditions. 1 2 THE COURT: Am I correct, though, that the two 3 residents live relatively close, Your Honor? 4 MR. HELMICK: Yes, as the crow flies they're very 5 close, but there's an expressway between the two, so 6 practically speaking, it may be a mile between the two residents to get there in terms of streets. It doesn't 7 8 take terribly long. 9 THE COURT: Why doesn't somebody pick the 10 children up and take them over --11 MR. HELMICK: Judge, they can, to the extent that 12 we can spare another body or someone who might otherwise be 13 a custodian. It's certainly possible to get them over 14 there. The practical problem that presents for us is that 15 Amera Akl's staying with her sister who has three children. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Five. 17 MR. HELMICK: Five children in a relatively small 18 home. All things considered, where she's staying, it's a 19 bit hectic and chaotic between the other children, her 20 nieces' and nephews' schedule, getting them to practices, 21 tutors and other things in the afternoon and early evening 22 and also having a custodian present. It's tough. 23 THE COURT: She has her own soccer mom duties. 24 MR. HELMICK: That's exactly right. Soccer and 25 other matters that make this logistically difficult.

also gives a break to a primary custodian in her sister and 1 2 her family during the afternoon and early evening to get 3 those things done that they need to do with their family, 4 which I'm sure include homework, soccer, as The Court 5 mentions, or so forth, it gives that break or window or 6 opportunity to everyone in the days and reduce some of the 7 strain on the custodians, on her sister's household during 8 that period of time. She would, of course, return there in 9 the early evening and be there for the remainder of the 10 night on electronic monitoring as she has been. 11 And again, Judge, as far as I know there haven't 12 been any problems with arrangements that have been made and 13 supervision that's occurred so far, but I defer to 14 Mr. Miller on particulars. 15 THE COURT: So do I. Any problems or issues? 16 PROBATION OFFICER: Not at this time, no, Your 17 Honor. 18 THE COURT: Have there been at all? 19 PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Sir. 21 MR. HERDMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. 2.2 be brief as well. I guess Mr. Helmick did want to be heard 23 on the motion. The government's position on this is we've 24 tried to be consistent throughout. And, again, we're not 25 insensitive to what I think is the fundamental issue here,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which is the needs of the Akl children. I'm a little concerned because I think in Mr. Schulman's motion that was filed, as well as Mr. Helmick's, I think what may be the overriding issue here is the notion of the custodians being overburdened or overtaxed. And again, I made this point with Mr. Schulman's motion, and I'll make it again. These custodians willingly agreed to serve in this capacity, took this responsibility on. And it seems that as the months have gone by, that they realized that this was a little bit -- they bit off a little bit more than they could chew, is what's going on here. And I'm not sure to the extent how much that custodial problem is driving this as opposed to the actual needs of the children. As far as the children are concerned, I will concede that there are some concerns that can probably be addressed through a court order. But the bottom line is this, the motion, I think, doesn't really address what it is that Mr. Helmick says the children need, which is they need access to their mother, both for help with their homework, scholastic assistance as well as just --

THE COURT: Maternal --

MR. HERDMAN: Exactly, Your Honor. So to that extent, they have contact with their father every day. As Mr. Helmick said, that residence, in terms of miles, is about a mile away. One of the alternatives that we had

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

suggested was that Mr. Akl could actually leave the residence for those five hours a day if that's, indeed, how much time is needed here. But there are other potential alternatives as well that I just, quite frankly, maybe don't have the creativity to think of. It seems like an incredibly generous amount of time to ask for, 25 hours a week seems like a lot of time to address these concerns. Ι also don't see the need for Mr. Akl to be present when Mrs. Akl is there to assist the children. And I also don't know if The Court's inclined to grant the motion wholesale or would consider some other alternative. I'm just not quite sure. THE COURT: My mind is entirely open. That's why I had this session. I mean, this is not just a, you know, let's go through the motions, but by the way, guys, this is what I'm going to do. That's why I had you all come here. MR. HERDMAN: But the government's fundamental concern has always been that the risk of flight increased substantially when Mr. Akl was released. That would allow both the defendants, I don't think there is a high likelihood of them fleeing. When Mr. Akl was released, I believe that risk of flight went up.

THE COURT: I would agree.

MR. HERDMAN: That would essentially make nullity of the previous motions, one of them would be that the

defendants have limited contact, and the fact that you reiterated that when you denied Amera Akl's motion to cohabitate with Hor. And in our position, this is essentially the same motion that's already been made, just maybe framed differently so that there's less time that they would actually come into contact. But if these defendants are serious about fleeing, five hours a day for five days a week, that's a significant amount of time for them to be able to plan, conspire, allowed to devise such a way that they could flee. And that remains a great concern to the government here. So we are -- we, again, we are not insensitive to the needs of the children, but I -- we're just trying to come up with sort of alternatives that would address those needs as well as The Court's concerns about the risk of flight that's increased here.

MR. HELMICK: May I respond briefly, Your Honor?

Judge, first, this is not in any way driven by perceived hardship by the custodians in the case. They've been cooperative and generous with their time, and I don't believe I mentioned specifically at all in the motion, I mention in the overall scheme of things that that's secondary. The primary goal here, and I'll be blunt with The Court, is the emotional and mental health of my client, his wife and their children. And it extends beyond just getting their -- the children's mother time with her, it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

includes him as well. We don't know how this case is going to end up. Both defendants face substantial prison sentences. But I would hate, at this point, to abandon the concept this was a close family and has been for many years. I understand why this disruption occurred and why it is necessary. All we're asking for is a reasonable accommodation for the children, for Mrs. Akl and for Mr. Akl, and, yes, I'm including him specifically because I think it's important that for a few hours a day, during the school days only, that they see their parents together. This is hard enough on a high school student who understands the nature of the charges they're facing. Ιt is a mystery to the younger children as to why their parents are living apart. And that's not a criticism of the government's position or The Court's decision, it just is what it is. And it seems to me this is a reasonable request. And any attempt to flee, again, I go back to involves collusion with court-approved custodians, whether they're living apart or together, but I contend, Judge, that the risk is lower if we're simply talking about the afternoon into the early evening on monitoring with a court-approved monitor and not overnight.

And for those reasons, we think this request is reasonable, particularly given the time that's gone by since the release of both defendants.

THE COURT: Mr. Herdman, anything further? 1 2 MR. HERDMAN: I think I've said what I have to 3 say. 4 THE COURT: I'm going to go ahead and grant the 5 I was inclined not to, quite candidly, but I think 6 Mr. Helmick pointed out, are the custodians here? 7 MR. HELMICK: Many of them are, yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: To some extent you are -- the risk 9 that you have accepted is being increased, the government's 10 correct. I constructed the conditions of release 11 deliberately to limit, to the maximum extent possible, the 12 ability to plan flight. I am increasing that risk 13 somewhat, and you should understand that that being so, if 14 you have any apprehensions that the consequences for you 15 that a flight were to occur or efforts were undertaken to 16 plan or prepare for flight or otherwise violate a material 17 condition of release, that you don't have to continue to 18 accept these responsibilities. Do you understand that? 19 CUSTODIAN: Yes. 20 THE COURT: The records should show at least four 21 out of the five people nod their heads. Sir, are you one 2.2 of the custodians, the gentleman on the far left? 23 CUSTODIAN: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Okay. One condition that I will 25 impose, it occurs to me, is that, Mr. Helmick, if you will

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

obtain and provide a copy of this transcript, and I want each of the people who have either posted property or who are serving as a custodian, or in any other way have interests that could be adversely effected in the case, there were a declaration of forfeiture to sign off and say that they concur in this changed arrangement. And the change will not be implemented until that one sheet or multiple sheets, however you want to set it up is fine -- I assume that the government would not object to that aspect? MR. HERDMAN: No, that would be fine. The only thing I ask if we can just make a record of the custodians that are present here in the courtroom. That's probably a good opportunity to THE COURT: stand and state your full name for the record. CUSTODIAN: Akram Mahmoud. MR. HELMICK: And this is Amera's Akl's brother-in-law, so she resides in his home. You've heard what I said, and you're THE COURT: willing to continue to help her out? CUSTODIAN: Yes. CUSTODIAN: Ali Joseph, I'm Amera's father. understand what you said, Your Honor. I'm willing to do what has to be done. CUSTODIAN: Akrum Mahmoud. THE COURT: Did you hear what I said?

1 CUSTODIAN: Yes. 2 THE COURT: I saw you nod your head up and down. 3 CUSTODIAN: Attay Mahmoud, Amera's sister, understand everything that was said. 4 I saw you nod your head too. 5 THE COURT: 6 MR. HELMICK: And Amera's mother. 7 CUSTODIAN: Najah Joseph, Amera's mom, and I understand everything you said. 8 9 THE COURT: Mr. Helmick, will you do the court 10 reporter a favor of giving her the names? 11 MR. HELMICK: I will, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: I would assume that it's not likely 13 the government will appeal, but Mr. Herdman, I would ask 14 that if you decide to do so, let me and counsel know 15 promptly so we know things that will be proceeding. 16 MR. HELMICK: Just so I'm clear, Your Honor, I 17 gather you would like to do a letter of instruction and 18 explanation as well as a copy of today's transcript? 19 If you don't want -- I was thinking THE COURT: 20 of the transcript because I hope maybe Angela will put the 21 periods in where they belong. The main thing is I don't 2.2 want somebody, if there is a problem, and Lord knows I hope 23 there isn't. Candidly, I don't think there's going to be a 24 problem. On the other hand, I think the government's 25 concerns, which I do share, I think I have to share, and I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

have to respond to those, that if worse comes to worse, I do not want to, but have the ability to levy upon the property or to issue show cause orders against custodians and who may appear to have been at fault or in any other way to be confronted in an effort to impose sanctions as a result of the forfeiture -- oops, wait a minute, you changed things material to me, if I'd known about it, I wouldn't have hung around. MR. HELMICK: Fair enough, Your Honor. THE COURT: So whatever you want to talk to Mr. Herdman, whatever seems to work so that there's a confirmation of the continued willingness to maintain whatever circumstances may be with regard to each of the people who are signatories to these obligations. MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor, I think that's an important point with respect to the surers, I think the only thing I would ask, would this order go into effect before those surers are notified? THE COURT: No, I want them to sign off first. MR. HELMICK: May I offer this as a possibility, if I were to have a conversation personally with each of them to explain what occurred today and then filed something with the court? THE COURT: I'd rather have it signed off on. Is there a problem in that regard? If the people are not

```
available --
 1
 2
               MR. HELMICK: I'm not sure or not.
 3
               THE COURT: If that's a problem, talk to Mr.
    Herdman and let me know. I don't want that to get in the
 4
 5
     way. I'll see --
 6
               MR. HELMICK: I don't anticipate a problem.
 7
               THE COURT: No, but if somebody's out of the
 8
     country or whatever, they're probably accessible by e-mail
 9
     or your representation pending their return. That's fine.
10
     But I don't want -- although I know full well you would
11
     fulfill that obligation thoroughly, none the less, I want
12
     the individuals to sign off.
               MR. HELMICK: Understood, Judge. Thank you.
13
14
               THE COURT: Anything further from the government?
15
               MR. HERDMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
16
               THE COURT:
                          Mr. Schulman?
17
               MR. SCHULMAN:
                              No, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: That will conclude this proceding.
19
               MR. HELMICK: Thank you, Judge.
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcrip
4	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
5	
6	s:/Angela D. Nixon
7	
8	Angela D. Nixon, RPR, CRR Date
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4 L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	